DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 555 CS 508 060

AUTHOR Sheffield, William T.
TITLE A Descriptive Analysis of Policy Issues in Non-Policy Debate.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Communication Research; *Debate; *Debate Format; Higher Education; Judges; Speech Communication; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Cross Examination Debate Association; Debate Tournaments; *Nonpolicy Debate

ABSTRACT

A descriptive study analyzed the contention that an artificial dichotomy exists between policy and non-policy debate. A 20-item survey instrument was constructed to address several relevant issues: the role of solvency in CEDA (Cross Examination Debate Association) debate; the nature of CEDA resolutions; and judging in CEDA. A total of 93 surveys (for a response rate of 32%) were returned by forensics directors at member institutions. Results indicated that: (1) while solvency is not viewed as being a stock issue in CEDA debate, a majority of respondents perceived solvency as being an acceptable issue, with many factors dictating its emphasis and effect on the debate round in particular; (2) CEDA does not focus purely upon one specific proposition orientation; and (3) a majority of respondents applied basic debate and argumentation "textbook" principles to the debate rounds they judged. Findings suggest that it would be erroneous to label CEDA as "purely" value debate. (Four tables of data are included; 18 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354555

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF POLICY ISSUES IN NON-POLICY DEBATE

William T. Sheffield
Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
Northeast Louisiana University
Monroe, LA 71209-0324
318/342-1408

Paper submitted to and presented at the
78th Annual Meeting of the
Speech Communication Association
Chicago, Illinois
October 29-November 1, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William T. Sheffield
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AS508060

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF POLICY ISSUES IN NON-POLICY DEBATE

The Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) that we know today originated from an organization formerly known as the Southwest Cross Examination Debate Association, or SCEDA (Watt & Pelham, 1986). The SCEDA was created in 1971 after a growing dissatisfaction with the style of debate offered by the National Debate Tournament (NDT) organization. As SCEDA grew nationwide, the organization evolved into what is known today as CEDA. Tomlinson (1986) explains the rapid growth of CEDA:

> The original vision of CEDA was one of a regional association that was small enough to be easily and informally administered. The rapid and largely unexpected growth of the organization forced the association to not only adopt a constitution and by-laws, but to elect regional representatives. Any organization that moves so rapidly from small scale to such a large scale must expect some stress to its administrative functions and even its goals and objectives as an organization. (p. 96)

Tomlinson seemed to have identified the larger problem of debate in CEDA when he stated that a necessary result of such growth is the blurring of goals and objectives within the organization. In addition to handling the problems of organizational growth, CEDA was also trying to maintain its identity in the debate world. As Schroeder (1989) notes:

> The Cross Examination Debate Association was born out of a variety of issues: among them, the desire to debate more than one topic. Other reasons for promoting CEDA include emphasizing communication between debater and judge, emphasizing reasoning over the volume of evidence read in a round, and emphasizing team or whole-squad success rather than one debate team. (p. 19)

Regardless of the original distinction between the two organizations, CEDA has found itself without a clear statement as

to the type of debate it wishes to promote. As Matlon (1988) notes:

> CEDA is an organization which has been very successful in sponsoring academic curricular debating and in producing a body of literature which makes it appear as the centerpiece of value debate activity, but the kind of debating which it wishes to sponsor is not clearly defined, particularly in terms of helping coaches teach students the analytical skills necessary to perform well in rounds of CEDA competition. (p.1)

A clear lack of direction has created an artificial dichotomy between policy and non-policy debate. While many educators and debaters argue that CEDA should approach CEDA topics from a value perspective, a closer examination of the topics would indicate otherwise. As Murphy (1992) contends:

> . . .the assertion that value debating is synonymous with CEDA. . .is misleading. Most recent CEDA topics are better classified (and were treated) as quasi-policy rather than as value propositions.

The focus of this paper is twofold: (1) to examine the controversy behind the policy/value dichotomy, and (2) present a descriptive analysis to support the author's contention of an artificial dichotomy between policy and non-policy debate.

POLICY/VALUE DICHOTOMY

Academic debate has mainly focused on two types of propositions: policy and value. The traditional delineation of these two has been that NDT debaters argue propositions of policy and CEDA debaters argue propositions of value. Corcoran (1988) attempts to explain the dichotomy when he writes:

> While policy debate advocates a change in the structure of the status quo, non-policy debate usually evaluates the relative value (good or bad, beneficial or detrimental) of something. Non-policy debate, as the negative prefix indicates, is everything outside the realm of policy debate, at least theoretically.

It is this artificial delineation, however, that has led to the current policy/value dichotomy.

In an attempt to delineate policy debate and value (or non-policy) debate, a particularly dangerous pattern of thought has emerged. Coaches and students perpetuating the policy/value dichotomy have held steadfast to the belief that CEDA propositions are exclusively value-oriented topics, when, in fact, CEDA propositions have varied in nature of orientation. As Bartanen (1982) notes, "A troublesome problem is the tendency of CEDA resolutions to vary in their nature from topic to topic" (p. 16). Hallmark's (1987) examination of CEDA topics confirms the notion that CEDA does not strictly promote value-oriented topics. He states, "In looking over the list of topics debated by the CEDA organization over the past 13 years I do not see any value topics. I see topics with value implications. I do not see value topics" (p. 6). Lawson (1986) identifies an all-too-common scenario:

> It is hardly a paragon of persuasive argumentation to hear an affirmative respond to negative press on policy implications with "But this is CEDA debate and we don't need a plan." Just as policy resolutions are not exempt from influence and effects of values, judgment resolutions are not exempt from the policies they may effect. (p. 21)

Even if one were to accept the position that CEDA resolutions were value-oriented, it would still be erroneous to separate policy issues from value issues. Ulrich (1984) is

correct in noting that the nature of propositions in value debate is often vague. He states that "despite the importance of the topic, there has been little discussion of the nature of the topic in value debate, and that discussion often is a minor part of a larger essay" (p. 1). Tuman (1987) notes:

> . . .no clear statement of all the issues necessary for a prima facie case in debating propositions of value has been articulated. The result. . .has been widespread confusion for value debaters, and a lack of uniformity in standards for evaluating propositions of value. (p. 87)

Hallmark (1987) notes that even value judgments rely on examining the effects that the advocacy of the value has in the real world (p. 9). Young and Gaske (1984) cite Rokeach in support of this position:

> Rokeach also claims that in order to determine which values are most desirable, end-states of the value must be considered. This suggests not only that value debates weigh policy manifestations of the values proposed in their case or by their opponents, but the necessity to do so in order to assess accurately the desirability of the basic value. (p. 27)

Miller (1988) confirms this when he contends:

> One cannot examine the role of policy implications in CEDA without a conceptual understanding of values. Values are important because they affect our actions, behaviors and policies. Because of the necessity of examining the actions/policies resulting from changing values, debating values without examining policy implications is inappropriate. The difficulty of debating values without an end-state perspective is manifested when critics penalize teams for looking at effects of values. Because policy implications are integral to a discussion of values, we cannot separate policy and value from CEDA debate. (p. 2)

In light of this position, it would seem appropriate to examine the issue of solvency in debating CEDA resolutions. The application of the stock issues found in policy debate, particularly the issue of solvency, would be appropriate in CEDA

debate. Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause (1990) refer to the issue of solvency, using the term "cost", in policy-oriented debate when they state, "Any change in policy will incur some cost, some disruption, some social or material burden. The advocate of change is obligated to be prepared to demonstrate that the disadvantages of the proposed change are not so great as to outweigh any benefits" (p. 45). Clearly, with acceptance of the fact that value and policy discussion cannot be separated, it would be easy to accept the issue of solvency in value-oriented debate. Not only does an understanding of the nature of value issues dictate such an approach, but as Hallmark (1987) notes:

> The position of solvency may be seen pragmatically in the topics which have been utilized over the past five years. In most of the past eleven topics including the one currently being debated, solvency has been a legitimate issue in the debate. (p. 15)

Perhaps it is, as Church (1986) notes, time to closely examine this concern:

> Although there is sometimes difficulty in deciding whether or not a given set of arguments constitutes a prima facie case in policy debate, most theorists and practitioners have no great problem deciding the components of a prima facie policy case. Yet, in non-policy debate the decision is not only difficult, it is usually not even considered. There is almost no discussion of the concepts for being "prima facie" in non-policy argument theory. Furthermore, there are very few attempts to argue the concept in CEDA debate. (p. 29)

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Methodology

A survey instrument of 20 questions was constructed addressing several relevant issues. Questions 1-13 dealt with the role or focus of solvency in CEDA debate.

Questions 14-18 were concerned with the nature of CEDA resolutions. Finally, questions 19 and 20 dealt with judging in CEDA. The author chose the issue of solvency because of its relation in the discussion of end-states (as discussed earlier). Each question employed a five-point Likert scale for scoring responses, with choices ranging from strongly agree (coded 1) to strongly disagree (coded 5) with a mid or neutral point (coded 3).

Subjects for this study were forensic directors at all member institutions at the time of this survey (April 1990). A current mailing list was used to determine the population for the questionnaire. The mailing of surveys yielded a return of 93 surveys, for a response rate of 32%.

The survey results were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) procedures for description of the responses to the statements and a factor analytical procedure to study the variables in the survey (Nie, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). This allowed for the reduction of a larger number of measures to a smaller number and for the examination of the relationships between the clusters of measures (Kerlinger, 1973).

Research Questions

The results of this study should allow us to answer several research questions. The first central issue is:

RQ1: Is solvency an acceptable issue considering the nature of CEDA topics?

Survey items regarding this research question examine burdens associated with the issue of solvency, as well as the

affirmative. A majority of the respondents felt that an affirmative value criteria did not necessarily need to be linked to a problem-solution format, nor did a significant majority feel the need to have a problem-solution format.

Perhaps the most significant response in this study was found in the statement "Solvency has no role in the evaluation of the debate round." Most of the respondents felt that solvency was in some way a part of the evaluation process.

These results suggest that while solvency has a role in CEDA debate, many factors dictate its emphasis and effect on the debate round in particular. These factors include the notion that the affirmative need only to show a propensity for solvency in defending their position; meanwhile, the negative is free to introduce and argue the need for solvency in the debate round and can indeed win the round by winning the issue of solvency. Many additional comments suggest that these factors are dependent upon the type of resolution being argued in the debate round. Research suggests that the issue of solvency can apply regardless of the type of resolution being argued. Results also show that there is not any prescribed format required for presentation of the affirmative position.

RQ2: What type(s) of proposition(s) does CEDA debate offer its participants?

The results indicate that CEDA does not focus purely upon one specific proposition orientation. Significant majorities rejected the idea that CEDA offered exclusively resolutions that were value-oriented or policy-oriented, while a fairly balanced number of responses were received on the statement "I believe

that CEDA resolutions are prepolicy-oriented resolutions." This would suggest that if CEDA resolutions are indeed "prepolicy" resolutions, debaters would need to be familiar with issues such as solvency (Hallmark, 1987; Miller, 1988). The majority of respondents agreed that CEDA offers a variety of propositional orientations, and even offers propositions of judgment. This result reaffirms the position that propositions of judgment also concern policy issues (Lawson, 1986). It seems, then, that regardless of the type of proposition being argued, issues such as solvency have a role in determining who wins the debate round.

RQ3: Do judges have difficulty determining how to evaluate CEDA debates?

While a fairly even number of respondents took sides on the statement "The difficulty of judging CEDA is because there are no guidelines or principles on what judges should look or vote for," the majority found themselves applying basic debate and argumentation "textbook" principles to the debate rounds they judge. These results may indicate several concerns: What textbook is being used? What do these textbooks prescribe as appropriate judging criteria/practice? How do debaters know when they are meeting the expectations of the judge in the round?

SUMMARY

The results give a fairly good picture of the current opinions regarding the nature of issues, particularly solvency, in CEDA debate. The nature of the topic could serve as a guide in determining the validity of arguing solvency in a CEDA debate round. This would confirm the notion that the issue of solvency

should not be rejected at face value. The results indicate that a majority of the respondents concede that CEDA resolutions are not pure value; indeed, they conform to the use of "proposition of judgment" in classifying CEDA resolutions.

Although the objectives of CEDA are stated in the CEDA Constitution, the organization is clearly lacking "rules of the game" (Schroeder, 1989). By identifying these "rules," CEDA would create better focus and argumentation in the debate round. The creation of stock issues would be one possible solution to this dilemma.

It is clear that one would be erroneous to label CEDA as "purely" value debate. While debate over values may occur within the bounds of any given round, the nature of values itself indicates that other issues, such as policy implications, need to be addressed. Eliminating discussion of solvency simply because "CEDA is value debate" is a problem that this paper has addressed. As debaters and coaches gain a clearer understanding of the nature of solvency and other policy implications in non-policy debate, we can develop rules and guidelines by which debates can be adjudicated. As a result, we can begin to eliminate the subjective nature of judging in CEDA.

The statement "I believe that CEDA resolutions are prepolicy-oriented resolution" had a mean score of 2.921, with 40.4% of the respondents agreeing with the statement and 28.1% disagreeing.

The response to the statement "I believe that CEDA resolutions often offer a variety of orientations. . ." had a mean score of 1.870. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents agreed with the statement, while 9.8% disagreed.

The statement "I believe that CEDA offers propositions of judgment (combination of fact and value)" had a mean score of 2.252. Of the respondents, 81.5% agreed with the statement, while 6.5% disagreed.

The responses to questions 19 and 20 are represented in Table 3. The response to the statement "The difficulty in judging CEDA is because there are no guidelines or principles on what judges should look or vote for" had a mean score of 3.077, with 48.4% of the respondents disagreeing with the statement and 45.1% agreeing.

Lastly, the statement "I apply basic debate and argumentation 'textbook' principles to the debate round when I am judging" has a mean score of 2.565, with 60.9% of the respondents agreeing and 21.8% disagreeing with the statement.

The responses were factor analyzed and six factors were rotated using the verimax rotation method (see Table 1). This procedure was performed in order to provide ". . .a more basic and more economical way to characterize the behavior we are

studying" (Williams, 1986). Kerlinger (1983) notes that ". . .there is not a generally accepted standard error of factor loadings" (p. 662). A .60 loading factor was imposed by the researcher in order to provide a rigorous standard for interpreting significant factors.

Defense/acceptability was the first factor identified. Items within this factor deal with solvency being a stock issue (.76), solvency being an acceptable issue (.85), the affirmative defending solvency if it is argued by the negative (.77), the affirmative winning solvency if it is argued by the negative (.77), the negative making solvency a voting issue (.82), the negative winning solvency (.84), and solvency having no role in the evaluation of the debate round (-.73).

The second factor identified was labeled problem-solution link. Items within this factor deal with the value criteria being linked to a problem-solution format of the affirmative case (.79) and the problem-solution format being necessary for the affirmative case to be prima facie (.84).

The third factor was labeled propensity/prepolicy-orientation. Items within this factor are the affirmative needing only to show a propensity for solvency in defending it (.60) and the belief that CEDA resolutions are prepolicy-oriented resolutions (.62).

The fourth factor identified was a singleton with one item, the belief that CEDA offers exclusively as its topics policy-oriented resolutions (.73).

The fifth factor was labeled variety/judging guidelines. Items in this factor were the belief that CEDA resolutions often offer a variety of orientations (.62) and the difficulty in judging CEDA because of the lack of guidelines or principles on what judges should look or vote for (.79).

The last factor was a singleton, the belief that CEDA offers propositions of judgment (a combination of fact and value) (.84).

Discussion

RQ1: Is solvency an acceptable issue in considering the nature of CEDA topics?

The results initially indicate that while solvency is not viewed as being a stock issue in CEDA debate, a majority of respondents perceived solvency as being an acceptable issue. In addition, over half of the respondents felt that solvency placed a prima facie burden on the affirmative in the round. This, however, contradicts the results indicating that solvency is not a stock issue in CEDA debate.

Regarding the defense of solvency, many felt that while the affirmative is responsible for defending the position of solvency, they are not required to win the issue. The results also indicate that the affirmative needs only to show a propensity for solvency in its defense, rather than being required to show 100% solvency; a strong percentage of respondents disagreed with this statement. Respondents indicated that the negative could make solvency a voting issue in the round and that the negative could win the round by winning solvency. Results showed that the respondents were fairly divided on whether solvency could serve as a reverse voting issue for the

requirements necessary in defending and arguing solvency. Additional items address the required presentational format in relation to the defense of solvency.

The second research question reflects on the nature of resolutions offered by CEDA:

RQ2: What type(s) of proposition(s) does CEDA debate offer its participants?

The earlier discussion contends that CEDA offers a variety of resolutional orientations. This question revolves around confirming the nature of CEDA resolutions.

The last research question is concerned with the lack of clear direction in CEDA and its consequent impact on the evaluation of debates. The lack of agreement between debaters and judges over the central issues in the debate has often led to misguided and superficial debate:

RQ3: Do judges have difficulty determining how to evaluate CEDA debates?

These research questions provide focus and isolate the key issues and concerns surrounding this study.

Results

The results of questions 1-13 are represented in Table 1. The response to the statement "Solvency is a stock issue in CEDA debate" had a mean score of 3.580. Twenty-five percent of the respondents found favor with the statement, while 61.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

The statement "Solvency is an acceptable issue in CEDA debate" had a mean score of 2.385, with 65.9% of the sample

either strongly agreeing or agreeing with the statement, and 22% of the respondents disagreed.

The statement "Solvency places a prima facie burden on the affirmative in the round" had a mean score of 2.820. The majority of the respondents (55.1%) found agreement with the statement, while 35.9% disagreed.

The statement "The affirmative must defend solvency if it is argued by the negative" had a mean of 2.911. 51.1% of the respondents agreed with the statement, while 40% disagreed.

The response to the statement "The affirmative must win solvency if it is argued by the negative" had a mean score of 3.281, with 51.7% of the respondents disagreeing with the statement. Of the respondents, 30.3% agreed to some extent with the statement.

The statement "The negative can make solvency a voting issue in the round" had a mean score of 2.522. Of the respondents, 68.9% agreed with the statement, while 25.6% disagreed.

The statement "The negative can win the round by winning solvency" has a mean score of 2.756. Of the respondents, 56.7% agreed with the statement, while 30% disagreed.

The response to the statement "Solvency has no role in the evaluation of the debate round" had a mean score of 3.656. Of the respondents, 68.9% disagreed with the statement and 16.7% agreed.

The statement "The affirmative must show 100% solvency in defending it" had a mean score of 4.511. Of the respondents,

94.6% disagreed with the statement, while 1.1% agreed with the statement.

The statement "The affirmative need only show a propensity for solvency in defending it" had a mean score of 2.451. Of the respondents, 69.2% agreed with the statement and 15.4% disagreed with it.

The statement "Solvency can be a reverse voting issue" had a mean score of 3.080. Of the respondents, 38.6% agreed with the statement and 28.4% disagreed.

The response to the statement "The value criteria must be linked to a problem-solution format of the affirmative case" had a mean score of 3.472, with 58.4% of the respondents disagreeing and 25.8% agreeing with the statement.

The response to the statement "A problem-solution format is necessary for the affirmative case to be prima facie" had a mean score of 4.076. Of the respondents, 83.7% disagreed with the statement, while 9.8% agreed with the statement.

The results for questions 14-18 are represented in Table 2. The statement "I believe that CEDA offers exclusively as its topics value-oriented resolutions" had a mean score of 4.011, with 79.3% of the respondents disagreeing and 17.4% agreeing with the statement.

The statement "I believe that CEDA offers exclusively as its topics policy-oriented resolutions" had a mean score of 4.380. Of the respondents, 94.6% disagreed with the statement and 2.2% agreed.

TABLE 1. Mean and Standard Deviation for Statement 1-13

STATEMENT	Mean	S.D.
1. Stock issue	3.580	1.238
2. Acceptable issue	2.385	1.227
3. Prima facie burden	2.820	1.319
4. Affirmative defense	2.911	1.286
5. Affirmative must win	3.281	1.225
6. Negative voting issue	2.522	1.343
7. Negative can win	2.756	1.301
8. No role for solvency	3.656	1.143
9. Must show 100% solvency	4.511	.638
10. Propensity for solvency	2.451	.992
11. Reverse voting issue	3.080	1.196
12. Value criteria link	3.472	1.216
13. Problem-solution format	4.076	.929

TABLE 2. Mean and Standard Deviation for Statements 14-18

STATEMENT	Mean	S.D.
14. Value-oriented	4.011	1.064
15. Policy-oriented	4.380	.660
16. Prepolicy-oriented	2.921	.944
17. Variety of orientations	1.870	.880
18. Propositions of judgment	2.152	.678

TABLE 3. Mean and Standard Deviation for Statements 19 & 20

STATEMENT	Mean	S.D.
19. No guidelines/principles	3.077	1.368
20. "Textbook" principles	2.565	.987

TABLE 4.

Table of Intercorrelated Factors
(Factors loaded at .60)

STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Stock issue	.76	.34	.00	.11	.00	-.12
Acceptable	.85	.09	.04	-.11	-.10	.08
Prima facie	.51	.28	.16	-.16	.29	.29
Defense	.77	.23	.19	.25	.02	-.16
Affirmative win	.77	.37	.00	.04	-.01	-.15
Voting issue	.82	.02	.16	.04	.13	.05
Negative win	.84	-.07	.05	-.16	.21	.16
No role	-.73	-.09	.11	.16	-.10	-.23
100% solvency	.18	.11	.21	-.58	.38	.01
Propensity	.46	-.03	.60	.13	.03	.05
Reverse voter	.08	-.02	.55	-.52	-.19	.33
Criteria link	.18	.79	.08	.13	.09	.16
Prob.-sol. format	.25	.84	-.01	-.09	-.01	.05
Value	-.44	.09	.55	.39	-.11	-.04
Policy	.09	.08	.03	.73	.14	.09
Prepolicy	.17	.05	.62	-.11	.01	-.12
Variety	.11	-.38	-.23	-.12	.62	.32
Judgment	.05	.16	-.09	.07	-.05	.84
No guidelines	.11	.18	.04	.14	.79	-.20
"Textbook"	-.40	.06	.50	-.31	.09	-.11

Works Cited

Bartanen, M. D. (1982). The role of values in policy controversies. Ceda Yearbook, 19-24.

Church, R. T. (1986). On being "prima facie"-An application to non-policy argument. Ceda Yearbook, 29-35.

Corcoran, J. (1988). An introduction to non-policy debating. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Hallmark, J. R. (1987). Solvency/efficacy in CEDA: A reevaluation of an accepted position. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lawson, H. (1986). Value and policy debate. In S. Wood & J. Midgley (Eds.), Prima facie: A guide to value debate (pp. 15-21). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Matlon, R. J. (1988). Debating propositions of value: An idea revisited. Ceda Yearbook, 1-14.

Miller, G. R. (1988). The role of policy implications in CEDA debate: An argument for the interrelationship between values and actions. The Forensic, 1-9.

Murphy, T. L. (1992). [Review of Debating Values]. Argumentation and advocacy, 149-151.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. (1975). SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schroeder, A. B. (1989). The nature of CEDA in the southwest. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

Tomlinson, J. E. (1986). Current issues in the cross examination debate association. National Forensic Journal, 91-103.

Tuman, J. S. (1987). Getting to first base: Prima facie arguments for propositions of value. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 84-94.

Ulrich, W. (1984). The nature of the topic in value debate. Ceda Yearbook, 1-6.

Watt, W., & Pelham, W. D. (1986). Profile of academic debate. In G. Wood & J. Midgley (Eds.), Prima facie: A guide to value debate (pp. 3-14). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Williams, F. (1986). Reasoning with statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Young, G. W., & Gaske, P. C. (1984). On prima facie value argumentation: The policy implications affirmative. Ceda Yearbook, 24-30.

Ziegelmueller, G. W., Kay, J., & Dause, C. A. (1990). Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.